DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 282 EA 029 804

AUTHOR Bulach, Clete; Boothe, Diane; Michael, Price
TITLE Supervisory Behaviors That Affect School Climate.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; *Principals; *School Supervision; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study that investigated the frequency with which principals practice behaviors believed to positively or negatively affect the supervisory climate that exists in a school. The secondary purpose of the research was to look at demographic factors, such as gender and grade level, that might influence a principal's supervisory behavior. Participants in the study included 208 teachers who were graduate students in a college of education. The instrument used in the study consisted of 52 items that asked teachers to describe the frequency with which they perceived their principal to be practicing behaviors that could negatively or positively affect a teachers' supervisory climate. Findings show that the educational climate was more positive than expected but much room for improvement remained. The lowest scores were in the conflict domain, which reflected teachers' views that their principals tended to avoid conflict, especially when a principal was reticent to question superiors. The behaviors in the trust domain were the most positive. Gender did not play a role in the supervisory climate, and it seemed that behaviors that promote a good supervisory climate affect both genders the same. However, female principals were rated better than male principals in instructional leadership. (Contains 12 references, 7 tables and the questionnaire.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 19-23, 1999)

EA

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS THAT AFFECT SCHOOL CLIMATE

ED 430 282

Clete Bulach, Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations
State University of West Georgia
Carrollton, GA 30118
770-214-8318 (H)
770-836-4460 (W)
770-836-4646 FAX
cbulach@westga.edu (e-mail)

Diane Boothe, Assistant Professor
Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education
State University of West Georgia
Carrollton, GA 30118
770-832-2086 (H)
770-836-4437 (W)
770-836-4646 FAX
dboothe@westga.edu (e-mail)

Price Michael, Professor
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations
State University of West Georgia
Carrollton, GA 30118
770-832-2675 (H)
770-836-4461 (W)
770-836-4646 FAX
pmichael@westga.edu (e-mail)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

C. Bulach

2A

EA 029 804

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS THAT AFFECT SCHOOL CLIMATE

Introduction

According to Urban (1999), "Unless students experience a positive and supportive climate, some may never achieve the most minimum standards or realize their full potential" (p. 69). Assuming this is true for the relationship that exists between teachers and students, is it possible that the same is also true for teachers and their principal? In other words, do teachers also need to experience a warm and supportive climate to reach their full potential? Peterson (1999) in discussing positive and negative cultures would answer this question in the affirmative. He stated that in some schools with positive cultures, teachers feel supported and are inspired to learn, grow, take risks, and work together. In schools with negative cultures, there is a spirit of helplessness and despair. It destroys motivation and decreases learning and fosters self-interest instead of collegiality.

Patterson (1993), noted that the values that promote positive cultures in schools are openness to participation, openness to diversity, openness to conflict, openness to reflection, and openness to mistakes. Regarding openness, Arnold (1995) suggested that creating opportunities for professional conversations leads to greater experimentation among teachers. More supervisory behaviors that encourage teacher leadership and innovation are needed. This would promote change and allow teachers to become creative and bolder at experimenting with innovative instructional strategies.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) discussed the feeling of community that is necessary for change and effective schools. They believe that collegiality can only occur in a caring and collaborative environment. Moreover, they stated that building this feeling of community is a basic purpose of supervision. Schools will only be improved if change occurs and change cannot occur without first developing and nurturing the right school climate and culture. They go on to say that climate and culture are shaped by the personal contact principals have with teachers during the supervisory process.

Boothe, Bulach, and Pickett (1998) investigated the behaviors of principals as they supervised or made personal contact with teachers. Basically, their study focused on mistakes principals make as they interact/supervise teachers. These mistakes or behaviors would tend to foster the negative culture described by Peterson (1999). Principals who frequently practiced these behaviors did little to develop and nurture the climate required for improving schools as described by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998). The basic premise of this research is that the supervisory climate that exists between principals and teachers is shaped by the behaviors practiced by principals. If the behaviors are disliked or viewed negatively by teachers a negative climate will develop, and if they are liked a positive climate will develop.

There is considerable research that identifies those behaviors and skills principals should have to lead effective schools. The National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals identified 12-13 leadership areas that are critical for effective leadership. There is also some research on behaviors principals should try to avoid or eliminate (Bulach, et. al., 1998; Davis, 1997; Martin, 1990). However, there does not appear to be any research on the frequency with which principals practice behaviors that are thought to positively or negatively affect the climate of the school.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the frequency with which principals practice those behaviors that are thought to positively or negatively affect the supervisory climate that exists in a school. A secondary purpose was to look at some demographic factors that might influence a principal's supervisory behaviors, e.g., gender, grade level, etc.

Hypotheses:

All hypotheses will be stated in the null format except for hypothesis # 1 which is stated as a directional hypothesis. It is stated this way because of the previous research Bulach et. al. (1998) where teachers identified 48 behaviors that principals practice that they do not like and that are considered leadership mistakes. If these mistakes are practiced by principals, a negative climate should result.

#1

The supervisory climate reported by teachers will be negative.

#2

There will be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the principal.

#3

There will be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the teachers.

#4

There will be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the level of preparation of the teachers.

#5

There will be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the years of experience of the teacher.

#6

There will be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the placement of the teacher.

Definitions

Supervisory climate = a score on the instrumentation ranging from a low of 48 (negative score) to a high of 240 (positive score).

Gender = male or female

Level of preparation = type of degree

Experience = number of years taught.

Placement = a teacher at the elementary, middle, high, or vocational school.

Methodology

This research is classified as descriptive research and incorporates the use of a survey. Teachers, in responding to the survey, described the frequency with which they perceived their principal to be practicing behaviors that could negatively or positively affect a teacher's supervisory climate.

The teachers involved in this study were 208 graduate students in the College of Education at the State University of West Georgia. The instrument was developed based on the earlier work of Boothe, Bulach, and Pickett (1998). The negative behaviors that were identified by teachers in that study were used to create the current survey instrument. The instrument consists of 52 items. Four items gather demographic data and 48 behaviors measure principal behaviors. Eighteen of the behaviors are stated positively with the rest stated negatively.

A factor analysis revealed that nine factors account for 64% percent of the variance in the instrument. Four of the factors which accounted for small amounts of variance were consolidated with other factors reducing the instrument to five factors. The factor that accounted for 38% of the variance measures a domain called "human relations." There are 13 items in this domain and they measure principal behaviors such as "demonstrates a caring attitude," "compliments teachers." "has good communication skills," etc. A Cronbach alpha on this factor yielded a reliability coefficient of +.86.

A factor/domain labeled "trust and decisions" accounted for 8% of the variance. There are 12 items in this domain and they measure principal behaviors such as "displays a lack of trust," uses coercion to motivate me "evaluates situations carefully before taking action," etc. A Cronbach alpha on this factor yielded a reliability coefficient of +.84.

A factor/domain labeled "instructional leadership " also accounted for 8% of the variance. There are 10 items in this domain and they measure principal behaviors such as "demonstrates a lack of vision," is knowledgeable about the curriculum," "provides feedback about my teaching," etc. A Cronbach alpha on this factor yielded a reliability coefficient of .85.

A factor/domain labeled "type of control" accounted for 5% of the variance. There are six items in this domain and they measure principal behaviors such as "assign too much paperwork," "is rigid and inflexible," "uses the words 'I' and 'my' too frequently," etc. A Cronbach alpha on this factor yielded a reliability coefficient of +.83.

A factor/domain labeled "dealing with conflict" accounted for 5% of the variance. There are seven items in this domain and they measure principal behaviors such as "is partial to influential parents," has double standards," is afraid to question his superiors," etc. A Cronbach alpha on this factor yielded a reliability coefficient of +.81.

A Cronbach alpha was also used to measure the internal consistency and reliability of the total instrument. A correlation coefficient of +.95 was obtained indicating the instrument has excellent reliability. The instrument has adequate construct validity in terms of those behaviors principals practice that teachers like or find offensive. This opinion is based on the premise that the behaviors in the instrument are the responses of more than 300 teachers who were asked to identify the mistakes or negative behaviors of their principal. The instrument is not a valid measure of school climate. However, it is a valid measure of behaviors thought to positively or negatively affect the climate that exists between a supervisor/principal and a teacher.

Results

Descriptive statistics were used to measure whether the supervisory climate reported by teachers was negative. Responses could vary from a low of 1.0 for a completely disagree response to a high of 5.0 for a completely agree response. Scores ranged from a low of 1.9* for the behavior "My principal has not supported me when parents were involved" to a high of 4.4 for the behavior "My principal calls me by name." The mean response for all behaviors was 3.63. Since 3.6, when rounded is 4.0 (an agree response), and since the most frequently occurring response (mode) was 4.0, hypothesis one was rejected, i.e., the supervisory climate reported by 208 teachers was positive and not negative.

The mean for each of the domains was compared to discern which domain had behaviors that principals practiced the most and the least (see table #1). The domain of "trust/decision-making" was the most positive with a score of 3.72. A score of 4.0 would mean that the principals often exhibit these behaviors. The domain dealing with conflict was the least positive with a score of 3.37, indicating that principals sometimes exhibited these behaviors (see Appendix A for the behaviors associated with each domain).

*all negative behaviors were reverse scored so that an agree response (4.0) is scored as a 2.0.

A t-test for independent groups was used to test hypothesis #2 that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the principal (see Table #2). There were 76 female and 68 male principals involved in the study.* The mean score for female principals was 3.55 compared to 3.72 for male principals. The t-test yielded a t-score of .94 ($p > .05$) Hypothesis #2, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the principal was accepted.

A t-test for independent groups was also computed for each of the factors measured by the instrument (See Table #3). While there are no differences as a result of the gender of the principal for the overall score or for the factors of human relations, control, and conflict, there were some differences on some of the behaviors in two of the factors. In the area of trust/decision-making, female principals had a score of 4.0 on the behavior "implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge" compared to 3.5 for male principals. The t-score was 2.6 and it was significant at the .009 level. This is a negative behavior and it has been reverse scored, e.g., Teachers disagreed that their principal practiced this behavior resulting in a score of 2.0. For analysis purposes, all negative items had to be reverse scored causing a score of 2.0 to be changed to a 4.0. Consequently, female principals tend to practice this behavior less than male principals.

Female principals tended to provide better instructional leadership than male principals. On the behavior "provides feedback on teaching," female principals had a mean score of 3.3 compared to 2.8 for male principals (t-score = 2.6, $p < .01$). On the behavior "is knowledgeable about curriculum," female principals had a mean score of 4.1 compared to 3.6 for male principals (t-score = 2.7, $p < .007$). On the behavior "is knowledgeable about instructional strategies," female principals had a mean score of 4.1 compared to 3.5 for male principals (t-score = 3.9, $p < .000$). On the behavior "applies procedures consistently," female principals had a mean score of 3.6 compared to 3.1 for male principals (t-score = 2.7, $p < .007$).

A t-test for independent groups was also used to test hypothesis #3 that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the teachers (see Table #4). There were 159 female teachers and 49 male teachers involved in the study. The mean score for female teachers was 3.58 compared to 3.89 for male teachers. The t-test yielded a t-score of 1.74 ($p > .05$) Hypothesis #3, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the teacher was accepted. The analysis of the factors for the supervisory climate revealed that there were no significant differences on any of the behaviors as a result of the gender of the teacher.

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA was used to test hypothesis #4 that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the level of preparation of the teachers. The Wilks' Lambda test of significance yielded an F score of .986 which was not significant ($p > .05$. Consequently, hypothesis #4, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the level of preparation of the teachers was accepted.

*Some of the 208 teachers in this study did not identify the sex of their principal.

The ANOVA on each of the factors disclosed that there was a significant difference for behaviors in only one of the factors--trust/decision-making (see Table #5). The behaviors that were significantly different are as follows: "displays a lack of trust ($p < .05$)," "corrects me in front of others instead of privately ($p < .05$)," "gossips about other teachers or administrators ($p < .05$)," and "nitpicks on evaluations ($p < .05$)." Bachelor degree teachers were more positive on every behavior than teachers at all other levels of preparation with teachers with a doctorate being the least positive.

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA was used to test hypothesis #5 that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the years of experience of the teacher. The Wilks' Lambda test of significance yielded an F score of 1.06 which was not significant ($p > .05$. Consequently, hypothesis # 5, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the years of experience was accepted.

The ANOVA on each of the factors disclosed that there was a significant difference for behaviors in two of the factors--trust/decision-making and method of control (see Table #6). One behavior was significantly different in the trust factor, and it was: "displays a lack of trust" ($p < .05$), "corrects me in front of others instead of privately" ($p < .05$). Two behaviors were significantly different in the control factor and they were as follows: "assigns duty during planning period" ($p < .01$), "uses the words 'I' and 'my' too frequently" ($p < .01$). "

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA was also used to test hypothesis #6, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the position of the teachers. The Wilks' Lambda test of significance yielded an F score of 1.48 which was significant at the .009 level. Consequently, hypothesis #6, that there would be no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the position of the teachers was rejected.

The ANOVA on each of the factors disclosed that there was a significant difference for behaviors in three of the factors-- human relations, trust/decision-making and instructional leadership (see Table #7). Five behaviors were significantly different in the human relations factor and they were as follows: "demonstrates a caring attitude" ($p < .05$), "does not listen" ($p < .01$), "models good communication skills" ($p < .05$)," "involves me in decisions," ($p < .01$), and "makes eye contact"($p < .01$.

The trust factor had two behaviors and the instructional leadership factor had four behaviors that were significantly different. They are as follows for the trust factor: "displays a lack of trust" ($p < .01$), "corrects me in front of others instead of privately" ($p < .01$), They are as follows for the instructional leadership factor: "provides feedback regarding my teaching " ($p < .05$), "is knowledgeable about curriculum" ($p < .01$), "demonstrates a lack of vision" ($p < .001$), and "is knowledgeable about instructional strategies" ($p < .05$).

Discussion

While the climate was more positive than expected, there remains considerable room for improvement. An analysis of each of the domains that make up the supervisory climate revealed that none of them had an agree (4.0) response that principals practice these behaviors. The lowest scores were in the conflict domain where it appears teachers view their principal as tending to avoid conflict. Low scores on "passing the buck," "afraid to question superiors," and "is partial to influential parents" are behaviors that principals are viewed as sometimes avoiding. One behavior "supports me even if I am wrong" was viewed positively by some and negatively by others. In questioning some of the teachers that were involved with the survey, it was discovered that some teachers want their principal to support them even if they are wrong and others do not. Apparently, teachers with a higher sense of self-efficacy are willing to admit when they are wrong and do not need their principal's support.

The behaviors in the trust domain were the most positive. The behavior in this domain that was the least positive was "has rules, but does not enforce them." The behaviors "corrects me in front of others" and "nitpicks on evaluations" were the most positive. Teachers disagree that their principal practiced these negative behaviors. It was interesting that the way principals make decisions aligned with the trust behaviors. Such behaviors as "making snap judgments" and "evaluates situations carefully before taking action" apparently can cause teachers to not trust their principal. Bulach (1990) stated that "ability" was part of the trust construct. It would follow that if a principal were to be perceived as making bad decisions, their ability would not be trusted. This would explain why trust and decision-making are in the same domain.

It was comforting to find that gender plays no role in supervisory climate. The question of whether male or female principals are better is frequently debated by students in educational leadership graduate classes. This study provides hard core data that there is no difference in the way their behavior is perceived.

The finding that female principals are much better than male principals in instructional leadership came as a surprise. On closer analysis this finding may be true only for the State of Georgia and not generalizable to other states. Georgia has one leadership certification allowing high school teachers with an administrative certificate to become elementary principals. Ninety of the 208 principals who were part of this study were elementary principals. There are many high school trained male elementary principals while most female principals are elementary trained. It would follow that elementary trained principals would be able to provide better instructional leadership than an elementary principal who had a secondary background.

The finding that there is no difference in supervisory climate as a result of the gender of the teacher was also encouraging. It would appear that behaviors which promote a good supervisory climate affect both genders the same. Gender makes no difference in how teachers want to be supervised. The big surprise here is the number of females involved in our study versus males. Seventy-eight percent of the students are female. School administration is rapidly becoming

female dominated profession.

The higher trust scores for beginning teachers and teachers with a bachelor's degree compared to teachers with more experience are both a surprise and a problem. Mean scores ranged from a high of 3.9 for beginning teachers to a low of 3.2 for teachers with 16-20 years of experience. Scores for a bachelor degree teacher versus a teacher with a doctorate were even worse with a high of 3.8 for a bachelor degree teacher versus 2.8 for a doctorate degree teacher. The more experience and education a teacher has, the less they believe their principal trusts them and involves them in the decision-making process. Beginning and bachelor degree teachers had more positive scores on all behaviors in this domain except one. To find that the more years of experience and education a teacher has, the less they believe their principal trusts them and involves them in decisions is very disconcerting. This finding reinforces the research of Bulach and Peterson (1999), who concluded that principals do not listen to their teachers or trust them.

The finding that teachers with more experience and training have lower trust scores could be a result of leadership style. Principals could be using the same authoritarian leadership style with experienced and better prepared teachers as well as beginning and bachelor degree teachers. According to Glickman (1998), beginning teachers may need a more authoritarian leadership style because of their level of maturity, experienced teachers require a more collaborative style.

Equally interesting was the finding that the more experience a teacher has the more a principal is perceived to use the words "I" and "my." The use of these words is perceived by teachers as a controlling behavior and a negative because they do not believe they belong to their principal as in "my teachers" or "my school." Teachers prefer the use of words such as "we" and "our" which are inclusive and sharing versus exclusive and controlling. As teachers gain experience and mature they become more independent, and they are more offended by the thought that they belong to someone.

The variable with the most impact on supervisory climate was the position of the teacher, i.e., where they taught. Significant differences were found on 11 of the 48 behaviors measured by the instrument with most of the behaviors being in the area of human relations and trust. This finding reinforces the work of Bulach (1998), who found that human relations is the leadership skill most likely to need improvement. Apparently, elementary teachers perceive their principals to be more caring and trustworthy than principals at other levels. The other area of difference was in the domain of instructional leadership. Elementary teachers perceive their principals to have more ability in curriculum and instruction than principals at higher levels.

Limitations of this study

The small number of vocational teachers in this study was a limitation. The three teachers from vocational schools frequently had more negative responses than teachers in other positions. This could have skewed some of our findings. Also, all three teachers could have come from one school and not have been representative of vocational schools.

This study only measured one aspect of school climate. It did not measure the overall school climate, which according to Bulach and Malone (1994) consists of nine variables. This study only measures the supervisory climate that exists between the principal and the teachers. There are many more variables such as order, expectations, parental involvement, etc., that make up the overall school climate.

Conclusion

It is important that schools become places where teachers are engaged in school reform or renewal efforts for improving the schools and where supervisory support encourages the entire staff to model behaviors that foster collegiality and a professional environment. The issue of teachers as a part of these professional communities must be addressed by supervisors who wish to improve their supervisory skill in building a more supportive climate for helping teachers reach their full potential. Teachers with more experience and training should be trusted and involved in the decision making process. In actual practice it appears that the opposite occurs. With more experience and training, teachers are perceiving their principal to be less trusting and less likely to involve them in the decision-making process. This has to change!

While there is a positive supervisory climate in many schools in the State of Georgia, there is certainly a lot of room for improvement. The climate appears to be the most positive in the elementary schools and elementary principals are better at instructional leadership and human relations. Georgia officials may need to look at the practice of allowing secondary trained personnel to assume principal positions in elementary schools. The data clearly demonstrates that male elementary principals with a secondary background are not as well trained in this area.

The behavior that occurred the most frequently as significantly different was the behavior "displays a lack of trust." Teachers as a result of position, experience, and education would like to see their principals practice this behavior more. Bulach and Peterson (1999) concluded their research with this comment **"Principals need to listen to their teachers! There are teachers who can be trusted!"** (p.9) Their conclusion is certainly reinforced with this research.

References

Bulach, C. R., & Peterson, T. (1999) "Levels of openness and trust: Do principals walk the talk?" A presentation at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference on 2-20-1999 at Hilton Head, NC.

Bulach C. R. (1998).The impact of human relations training on selected leadership skills." A presentation at the Southern Regional Council of Education Administration at Savannah, GA 11-1-1998

Bulach, C. R. , Boothe, D., & Pickett, W. (1998). "Should nots" for school principals: Teachers share their views. ERS SPECTRUM: Journal of School Research and Information, 16(1), 16-20.

Bulach, C. R., & Malone, B. (1994). The relationship of school climate to the implementation of school reform. ERS SPECTRUM: Journal of School Research and Information 12(4), 3-9.

Bulach, C. R. (1993). A measure of openness and trust. People in Education,1(4), 382-392.

Davis, S. H. (November, 1997). The principal's paradox: Remaining secure in a precarious position. NASSP Bulletin, 81, 73-80.

Glickman, C. D. (1998). Supervision of instruction Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Martin, J. L. (1990). Superintendents and unsuccessful principals: A limited study in the State of Oregon. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 937)

Patterson, J.(1993). Leadership for tomorrow's schools. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Peterson, K. D. (1999). Time use flows from school culture. Journal of Staff Development, 20(2), 16-19.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1998). Supervision: A redefinition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Urban, V. D. (1999). Eugene's story: A case for caring. Educational Leadership, 56(6), 69-70.

Table #1

A comparison of supervisory climate scores by domain

Domain	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Trust/decision-making	10	3.72	1.11
Control	5	3.66	1.14
Instructional Leadership	9	3.58	1.07
Human Relations	13	3.52	1.05
Conflict	7	3.37	1.17

Table #2

The effect of the gender of the principal on a principal's supervisory climate scores

Gender of the principal	N	M	SD	t-score	P_
Female	76	3.55	1.15	.94	.35
Male	68	3.72	.98		

P > .05
df = 142

Table #3

The effect of the gender of the principal on the factors that make up a principal's supervisory climate scores

Factor Behaviors	Gender	N	M	SD	t-score	P_
Trust/decision-making						

			Supervisory climate			
implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge	F	76	4.0	1.1	2.6	.009**
	M	68	3.5	1.3		
Instructional leadership						
provides feedback on teaching	F	76	3.3	1.2	2.6	.01*
	M	68	2.8	1.2		
knowledgeable about curriculum	F	76	4.1	1.0	2.7	.007**
	M	68	3.6	1.0		
knowledgeable about instructional strategies	F	76	4.1.	91	3.9	.000***
	M	68	3.5	1.0		
applies procedures consistently	F	76	3.6.	1.0	2.7	.007**
	M	68	3.1	1.0		

Human relations--no significant differences found

Control--no significant differences found

Conflict--no significant differences found

*.05 level **.01 level ***.001 level
df = 142

Table #4

The effect of the gender of the teacher on a principal's supervisory climate scores.

Gender of the teacher	**N**	**M**	**SD**	**t-score**	**P**
Female	159	3.58	1.03	1.74	.08
Male	44	3.88	.99		

P > .05
df = 201

Table #5

The effect of the level of teacher prepartion on the factors that make up a principal's supervisory climate scores.

Factor Behaviors	Preparation	N	M	SD	F-scoreP_
Trust/decision-making					
displays a lack of trust	Bachelor's	55	3.8	1.0	2.6 .036*
	Master's	100	3.7	1.0	
	Specialist	43	3.4	.96	
	Doctorate/Other	10	2.8	.63	
corrects me in front of others instead of privately	Bachelor's	55	4.6	.74	2.9 .022*
	Master's	100	4.3	1.0	
	Specialist	43	4.1	1.1	
	Doctorate/Other	10	4.1	1.4	
gossips about other teachers or administrators	Bachelor's	55	4.2	.94	2.6 .036*
	Master's	100	4.0	1.2	
	Specialist	43	3.6	1.1	
	Doctorate/Other	10	3.5	1.1	
"nitpicks" on evaluations	Bachelor's	55	4.6	.74	2.9 .022*
	Master's	100	4.3	1.0	
	Specialist	43	4.1	1.1	
	Doctorate/Other	10	4.1	1.4	

Instructional leadership--no significant differences found

Human relations--no significant differences found

Control--no significant differences found

Conflict--no significant differences found

*05 level **.01 level ***.001 level
df = 207

Table #6

The effect of the year's of a teacher's experience on the factors that make up a principal's supervisory climate scores

Factor Behaviors	Experience	N	M	SD	F-scoreP
Trust/decision-making					
displays a lack of trust	0 - 5 years	72	3.9	1.1	3.3 .015*
	6 - 10 years	53	3.7	.96	
	11 - 15 years	36	3.5	1.0	
	16 - 20 years	21	3.2	.86	
	21+ years	26	3.6	1.0	
Control					
assigns duty during planning period	0 - 5 years	72	3.6	1.1	3.9 .004**
	6 - 10 years	53	4.2.	.96	
	11 - 15 years	36	3.5	1.4	
	16 - 20 years	21	3.8	1.3	
	21+ years	26	3.8	1.2	
uses the word "I" and "my too frequently	0 - 5 years	72	3.9	.89	3.8 .006**
	6 - 10 years	53	3.8.	.95	
	11 - 15 years	36	3.9	1.0	
	16 - 20 years	21	3.6	1.3	
	21+ years	26	3.1	1.1	

Instructional leadership--no significant differences found

Human relations--no significant differences found

Conflict--no significant differences found

*.05 level **.01 level ***.001 level
df = 207

Table #7

The effect of position of the teacher on the factors that make up a principal's supervisory climate scores.

Factor Behaviors	Position	N	M	SD	F-score	P
Human Relations						
demonstrates a caring attitude	Elementary	90	4.0	.94	3.1	.02*
	Middle	53	3.5	.85		
	High School	54	3.6	1.0		
	Vocational	3	4.0	1.0		
	Other	8	4.3	.71		
does not listen	Elementary	90	3.9	1.0	3.6	.008**
	Middle	53	3.3	1.1		
	High School	54	3.4	1.1		
	Vocational	3	4.0	1.5		
	Other	8	4.1	.92		
models good communication skills	Elementary	90	3.8	1.0	2.8	.03*
	Middle	53	3.3	1.2		
	High School	54	3.5	.86		
	Vocational	3	3.6	.58		
	Other	8	3.9	.83		
involves me in decisions	Elementary	90	4.5	1.0	4.2	.003**
	Middle	53	4.2	1.1		
	High School	54	4.1	1.1		
	Vocational	3	2.6	1.1		
	Other	8	4.4	1.1		
makes eye contact	Elementary	90	4.2	1.1	3.5	.009**
	Middle	53	3.9	1.0		
	High School	54	3.7	.81		
	Vocational	3	2.7	.58		
	Other	8	4.4	.74		
Trust/decision-making						
displays a lack of trust	Elementary	90	3.9	.93	3.5	.008**
	Middle	53	3.5	1.1		

Supervisory climate . . . . . .

	High School	54	3.5	1.0		
	Vocational	3	2.3	1.2		
	Other	8	3.6	1.0		
corrects me in front of others instead of privately	Elementary	90	4.5	.77	3.5	008**
	Middle	53	4.2	1.2		
	High School	54	4.1	1.2		
	Vocational	3	2.6	2.0		
	Other	8	4.4	.74		
Instructional Leadership						
provides feedback regarding my teaching	Elementary	72	3.3	1.1	3.0	002**
	Middle	53	2.9	1.1		
	High School	36	2.8	1.2		
	Vocational	21	2.0	1.0		
	Other	26	3.5	1.5		
is knowledgeable about the curriculum	Elementary	90	4..1	.91	4.5	.002**
	Middle	53	3.5	1.0		
	High School	54	3.7	.90		
	Vocational	3	4.3	1.2		
	Other	8	4.1	1.1		
demonstrates a lack of vision	Elementary	90	4.3	1.0	5.0	.001***
	Middle	53	3.7	1.1		
	High School	54	3.9	1.1		
	Vocational	3	2.0	1.0		
	Other	8	4.1	1.1		
is knowledgeable about	Elementary	90	4.5	.98	2.4	05*
instructional strategies	Middle	53	4.2	.96		
	High School	54	4.1	.96		
	Vocational	3	2.6	1.0		
	Other	8	4.4	1.4		

Control--no significant differences found

Conflict--no significant differences found

*.05 level **.01 level ***.001 level
df = 207

SELECTED CHARACTER VALUES AND THEIR CORRESPONDING BEHAVIOR

Human Relations

Item #

6. My principal demonstrates a caring attitude.
7. My principal provides positive reinforcement.
8. My principal interacts with the staff.
9. My principal remains distant.
10. My principal calls me by name.
12. My principal compliments me.
14. My principal does not listen.
15. My principal uses eye contact.
18. My principal models good communications skills.
23. My principal has not supported me when parents were involved.
32. My principal remembers what it is like to be a teacher.
35. My principal tells teachers to make due with what they have.
40. My principal involves me in decisions.

Trust

5. My principal displays a lack of trust.
13. My principal uses coercion to motivate me.
17. My principal corrects me in front of others instead of privately.
20. My principal gossips about other teachers or administrators.
37. My principal "nit picks" on evaluations.
47. My principal makes "snap judgements."
49. My principal implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge.
50. My principal bases evaluations on a short observation.
51. My principal evaluates situations carefully before taking action.
52. My principal makes decisions as "knee jerk" reactions to an incident

Instructional Leadership

16. My principal provides feedback regarding my teaching.
24. My principal demonstrates a lack of vision.
25. My principal is knowledgeable about the curriculum.
26. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional strategies.
30. My principal shrugs off or devalues a problem or concern.
33. My principal frequently interrupts my teaching.
43. My principal applies procedure consistently.

44. My principal holds people accountable.
45. My principal fails to follow up.
46. My principal has rules but does not always enforce them.

Conflict

19. My principal is able to keep a confidence.
21. My principal shows favoritism to some teachers.
22. My principal has double standards.
27. My principal is partial to influential parents.
28. My principal supports me even if I am wrong.
29. My principal is afraid to question his/her superiors.
31. My principal "passes the buck" rather than dealing with a situation.

Control

11. My principal delegates responsibility.
34. My principal assigns too much paperwork.
36. My principal assigns duty during planning period.
38. My principal expects work to be done "yesterday" with no notice.
39. My principal overemphasizes control.
41. My principal uses the words "I" and "my" too frequently.
42. My principal is rigid and inflexible.

copyright 1999
By C.R. Bulach